



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/526,441	03/16/2000	Kamran Ahmed	10442-4"US" JA/mb JA/mb	2595

20988 7590 08/02/2002

OGILVY RENAULT
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE
SUITE 1600
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3
CANADA

EXAMINER

BRIER, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/526,441

Applicant(s)

AHMED, KAMRAN

Examiner

Jeffery A. Brier

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 27 June 2002 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 06/27/2002 has been entered. Pages 3, 4, 6-9 and 11 and the abstract have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21, 22 and 25 have been amended. Claims 28-33 are newly added claims.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 06/27/2002 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(a)(6) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of figure 6. Page 10 line 27 of the originally filed specification briefly refers to figure 6 however, it is not described. Since figure 6 was not present in the application at the time of examination and since there is no evidence to indicate that it was provided with the originally filed application, the submission of figure 6 is introducing new matter into this application.

3. The proposed drawing correction of figures 1-5, 7 and 8 filed on 06/27/2002 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2672

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: reference number 112 added in the proposed drawing correction. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 13 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 13 line 2 "two displays outputs" should be "two display outputs. Claim 28 line 2 "comprises automatically a standard" should be "comprises automatically determining a standard". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This claim now claims a single

Art Unit: 2672

display output. The originally filed specification did not describe a single display output. It did describe toggling between zoom displays and main display, note pages 7 and 9 of the specification.

8. Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims claim dragging or moving the user selected portion over the frame buffer memory. The specification enables selecting a different portion of the image but does not enable moving the image within the frame buffer memory.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims, particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 6-11, 15-20 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 6-10:

These claims are indefinite because they either claim the drawing processor or backend scaler as being associated with the display controller system while claim 1 has been amended to claim the scaling is performed in the display controller system.

Claims 6-10 are broader than claim 1 due to the associated term. A processor

Art Unit: 2672

associated with a system is not necessarily in the system. Claim 11 depends upon claim 6 and does not correct the indefiniteness of claim 6.

Claim 12:

This claim is indefinite because at lines 3 and 4 "said single display" lacks antecedent basis in this claim.

Claim 15:

This claim is indefinite because at line 3 "said main surface display" lacks antecedent basis in the claim. Applicant should amend claim 1 to make reference to a main surface display. Note: if applicant amends claim 1 to refer to a main surface display then claims 29 and 32 will need to be amended to correctly refer to said main surface display rather than a main display.

Claim 19:

This claim is indefinite because at line 3 "said main surface display" lacks antecedent basis in the claim. Applicant should amend claim 1 to make reference to a main surface display.

Claim 31:

This claim is indefinite because "automatically choosing" departs from the terminology used in claim 21 which claimed determining rather than choosing and because choosing implies the standard resolution is being chosen rather than determined.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-24, and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ranganathan, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,201.

Claims 1 and 21:

Ranganathan describes a system that allows the user to select an application that has a movie window (figure 3). This act of selecting a window selects a portion of the frame buffer because at column 12 lines 18-19 the movie is stored in a separate portion of the frame buffer. A scaler 64 scales the movie to fit the resolution of the monitor 24. Both the frame buffer and scaler reside within the display controller system. Column 7 lines 48-50 describes a graphics screen with a smaller window of a movie and column 8 lines 63-66 describes scaling the movie and displaying the scaled movie on monitor 24.

Claims 2 and 22:

Note hardware cursor generator 53 of Ranganathan.

Claims 3 and 23:

Note column 8 lines 60-66 of Ranganathan. Interpolation does reduce coarseness of expanded images.

Art Unit: 2672

Claims 4 and 24:

Note Ranganathan's column 8 line 65 which describes duplication which causes coarse pixels and interpolation which causes less coarse pixels.

Claims 6 and 9-11:

These claims claim using an associated drawing engine to scale the portion into a buffer. Inherently Ranganathan's system has a drawing engine which renders a scaled version of the selected portion into the a portion of the frame buffer, note column 12 lines 18-19.

Claim 7:

Ranganathan's scaler 64 corresponds to applicants described and claimed backend scaler.

Claim 12:

Ranganathan's system allows the user to toggle between graphics and movie.

Claim 13:

Ranganathan's column 12 lines 18-19 describes displaying from the frame buffer the graphics on LCD 22 and the movie from a portion of the frame buffer on monitor 24, thus, essentially all of the frame buffer is displayed on LCD 22.

Claim 14:

Ranganathan's scaler 64 converts the movie to fit the resolution of monitor 24, note column 8 lines 59-66 and column 12 lines 45-52.

Art Unit: 2672

Claims 15-20:

Ranganathan's system allows any number of portions of the main display to be zoomed onto to the zoom display (monitor 24), graphics or movie. Thus, Ranganathan's system meets these claim limitations.

Claim 26:

Ranganathan's system inherently uses a drawing engine to draw the images including the part of the image including the movie into the frame buffer.

Claim 27:

Not column 8 line 60 of Ranganathan.

Claims 28 and 31:

Ranganathan determines or as applicants claims chooses the resolution of the zoom display, note column 12 lines 43-52.

Claims 29 and 32:

Ranganathan's system displays on the LCD a full screen and on the monitor a full screen, note column 7 lines 51-65 and column 8 lines 57-66.

Claims 30 and 33:

Ranganathan's zoom display is monitor 24 which is a CRT.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,201. In Ranganathan's system the cursor is selected by muxes 32, 42 and it is not scaled, however, scaling would be desirable if monitor 24 is high resolution and the cursor is low resolution, thus, without scaling the cursor will appear small on the high resolution monitor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention to scale the cursor in Ranganathan's display controller in order make the cursor legible on a high resolution monitor because column 12 lines 50-51 of Ranganathan suggests this by writing "Interpolation of pixels and lines may also be used to adjust the display size." In conjunction with the writing at column 12 lines 43-44 "When image of different resolutions are to be displayed on both the CRT and flat panel".

Art Unit: 2672

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery A. Brier whose telephone number is (703) 305-4723. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (703) 305-4713).

Art Unit: 2672

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Jeffery A Brier
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2672